REMARKS

This responds to the **February 4, 2010** Office Action.

In the Office Action, claims 111-114, 116-127, 129 and 131-138 are noted as pending in the application, claims 111-114, 116-120, 127, 129 and 131-134 stand rejected, no claims are objected to and no claims are allowed. Claims 121-126 and 135-138 have been withdrawn from consideration.

Applicants appreciate the review and discussion of Applicants' earlier response.

Claim 111 is objected to because it recites "from an associate one or more cameras". The claim term has been corrected.

Rejections

Claims 111-114, 116-120, 127, 129, 131, and 133 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Enright et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,583,813) in view of Fernandez et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,697,103) in further view of Igarashi et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,469,737).

Applicant continues to maintain that Enright fails to disclose the provision of live video signals. The focus in the Office Action is on the mention of capturing image and transaction data while virtually simultaneously delivering image and transaction data to a remote user. Applicant submits that it is clear from the context that Enright is simply talking about an ability to provide recorded video without disabling capture, hence facilitating maintaining the ATM in operation. Applicant reserves the right to continue this argument during subsequent prosecution.

The rejections on Enright, Fernandez and Igarashi are believed to be moot in view of the foregoing amendments that adopt claim terms directed to a schedule manager, which claim elements have been prosecuted in a corresponding European application and found to be novel and an inventive step. The amended claims are within the originally filed claims, and therefore can be prosecuted in the present application.

Limitations introduced in the previous response to differentiate from the Enright reference have been withdrawn, as being unnecessary in view of the presently-added recitation of the schedule manager.

The new recitation to the schedule manager have been introduced into claim 111. These are based on limitations which were found by the EPO to render novel and inventive the claims of the corresponding European patent application. The new limitations are focused on a schedule manager:

> a schedule manager configured to periodically polling a database thereby
>
> to cache a list of record requests thereby to determine a schedule

Support for this limitation is found at page 19, lines 20-22 of the present application/PCT publication.

The schedule manager can be used to indicate how the recording schedule is predetermined. Specifically, the schedule is predetermined by a schedule manager, which periodically polls a database and caches a list of record requests to predetermine a schedule. See page 19, lines 20-22 of the present application.

The presently claimed schedule manager is differentiated from the "timing/sequence logic component" disclosed in Enright (see primarily col. 21, lines 20-41). Enright's "timing/sequence logic component" is configured to implement logic for event-based recording, and is "operative responsive to programmed instructions input by a user during setup of the system". Accordingly, there is no disclosure of "periodically polling a database thereby to cache a list of record requests thereby to determine a schedule". Furthermore, Enright is concerned with recording based on motion detection, as opposed to a predetermined schedule.

Although Fernandez mentions scheduling (see, for example, col. 9, lines 25-65), the Fernandez approach is entirely different to that presently claimed, as it does not rely on "periodically polling a database thereby to cache a list of record requests thereby to determine a schedule". In particular, Fernandez is particularly concerned with using an object activity schedule as a reference point for determining compliance (for example thereby to determine whether a delivery is on time or late based on the schedule for that

delivery), as opposed to a predetermined schedule for controlling image capture. Igarashi, on the other hand, is unconcerned with predetermining of a schedule.

The present approach of polling can be particularly important in terms of system scalability, for instance in the context of large-scale surveillance systems as presently considered in one example, which make use of a large number of cameras and camera servers. It allows an approach whereby record requests are initially centralized at a database (for example following requests made from clients), and it is the responsibility of schedule manager (which may generally run on each individual camera server, in one example) to periodically poll the database thereby to determine its own schedule for recording. This is far more efficient than, for example, an approach of providing record instructions directly to each video server as those instructions are generated. Accordingly, it would not have been obvious to implement the presently claimed solution based on any of the art of record.

Claims 112-114, 116-120, 127, 129, and 131-134 are dependent directly or indirectly from independent claim 111 and are asserted as being patentable for the same reasons as discussed with respect to claim 111, for the combinations in the dependent claims as well as for the additional limitations recited in the dependent claims.

Applicant's Disclosure

Applicant's disclosure has been discussed previously and that discussion will not be repeated here.

Reconsideration of the application and claims in view of the foregoing amendments and remarks is respectfully requested. Early notice of allowance thereof is earnestly solicited.

This response is being filed with a payment for A One-Month Extension of Time.

The Director is hereby authorized to charge any fees under 37 CFR 1.16 and 1.17 which may be required by this paper to Deposit Account No. 50-0655. Please charge any omissions or deficiencies that may be due or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 50-0655.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: June 4, 2010   ___/James A Henricks/_____
                                                        James A. Henricks
                                                        Registration No. 31,168

HENRICKS, SLAVIN & HOLMES LLP
840 Apollo Street, Suite 200
El Segundo, CA 90245-4737
310-563-1456
310-563-1460 (fax)
jhenricks@hsh-iplaw.com (Email)